

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 RON KICZENSKI,

No. 2:03-cv-2305-MCE-GGH-PS

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

ORDER

14 JOHN ASHCROFT, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

17 On February 24, 2006, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein  
18 which were served on the parties and which contained notice that any objections to the findings  
19 and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. Plaintiff filed objections on March 6,  
20 2006, defendants filed a reply to plaintiff's objections on March 16, 2006, and they were  
21 considered by the district judge.

22 This court reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to which  
23 objection has been made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore  
24 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). As  
25 to any portion of the proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court  
26 assumes its correctness and decides the motions on the applicable law.


1 See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's  
2 conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist., 708  
3 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

4 The court has reviewed the applicable legal standards and, good cause appearing,  
5 concludes that it is appropriate to adopt the Proposed Findings and Recommendations in full.  
6 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

7 1. The Proposed Findings and Recommendations filed February 24, 2006, are  
8 ADOPTED; and

9 2. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is granted, and judgment is entered for  
10 defendants.

11 DATED: March 30, 2006

12  
13  
14   
15 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.  
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26